

Ozone Working Group – March 23, 2004

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize public comments and discussion at the March 23, 2004 Ozone Working Group meeting.

- Commenter believes meeting notes are too brief, do not reflect depth of comments.
- Clarification on “measures needing funding” – does this mean that District will have to come up with funding? Does this mean that “potentially viable” measures have funding available? Response: Most of the “Needs Funding” measures are incentive programs that would require additional funding in order to provide financial incentives to convert to cleaner vehicles, fuels or equipment.
- Regarding stationary sources – seems that some of the measures are duplicative. Would recommend synthesizing similar measures as the District moves forward with the process. Response: The evaluation tables do include redundant measures. This is because the District received similar suggestions from multiple sources, and chose to list them separately to make clear all the ideas, and sources of those ideas, that were considered. The control measure descriptions do consolidate similar ideas into single measures.
- Commenter believes there is a step missing in the transition from the multiple suggestions to the control measure descriptions. Would like to see differences between the suggestions addressing the same category articulated.
- Congestion pricing was not included in the TCM evaluations – is not in Table of Contents. It is important to distinguish congestion pricing from other pricing measures (e.g., bridge toll). Would have like to see evaluation of congestion pricing separate from both bridge toll and HOT-lane evaluations.
- Green contracting ordinance – commenter would like to see incentives or fiscal conditioning as part of the control measure. Suggests conditioning MTC funding to local governments.

- Measure 218 (ambient air monitoring). Need to know local emissions, especially in EJ neighborhoods. Could lead to additional control measures. Should pursue this measure.
- Commenter is not confident about MTC evaluations and calculations. Does not accept them.
- Should pursue #199 (Pilot Credit Generation – Ship Hoteling) and #201 (Truck Stop Electrification), which are listed under measures with negligible emission reductions. Although there are not many truck stops in the Bay Area, many trucks stop along San Leandro Blvd. Bay Area needs a truck stop with electric hook-ups, e.g., at the Hayward airport.
- Concerned about high truck emissions in West Oakland.
- Supports measure #1 (Clean Vehicles/Engines/Fuels).
- Refinery flare measures are needed. Refineries in Richmond and Martinez are a problem.
- Agree with measure #15 (Replace Gasoline Powered Lawnmowers with Electric Ones).
- AC Transit currently studying Rapid Bus on San Pablo Ave. Believes that study will show greater effectiveness.
- Supports measure addressing truck idling, #14 (Truck Idling Rule and Devices).
- Concept of electrification that is used at airports could be applied to trucks.
- Commenter is concerned about truck idling impacts on housing near truck loading docks in Davis West area in San Leandro. Should have program penalizing truck idling.
- TCM evaluation #15 (Bike Storage at Rail Stations) uses different assumption than TCM 5 (Improve Access to Rail and Ferries) for estimate of BART users riding bikes. Correct figure is closer to 2% than 1%.

- Don't agree with assumptions in TCM evaluation 16 (Safe Route to Transit), should assume greater increase in access. Question BART ridership figures. Response; 6,250 refers to trips reduced, not BART ridership.
- Proliferation of gas-powered toys (scooters) is a concern. Response: ARB has not yet looked at this as it is a relatively new phenomenon.
- Commenter disagrees with response on page 5 of TCM Evaluation Appendix 2 (regarding MTC's ability to condition funds). MTC had previously stated that funding could be conditioned, but would face legal and political obstacles – this should be reflected in the notes. Believes MTC has not reached its limit to condition funds.
- Commenter would like additional information to show what was added to the suggested TCMs so that it could be seen how they have changed. Would like to see the changes. Response: Staff described new elements to TCM 15, Local Land Use Planning & Development Strategies.
- Flare control rule – other impacts. Explain reference to incinerators under Flares description (page 10). Don't flares emit pollutants? Does BACT apply? Would like to see vapor recovery and backup electrical supply included in proposed controls. CBE has provided comments and suggestions. Flare emissions were reduced when Tesoro installed compressors. CBE supports ban on routine flaring that is not considered emergency.
- TCM 5, Improve Access to Rail and Ferries. Suggest that station car installations include dedicated secure bike parking. Some station car users may not ride transit. Bike parking complements utility of the program.
- Interested in TCM 10, Youth Transportation. Evaluation should include trips made by parents taking children to school. Could reduce school trips with shuttles, school buses.
- MTC Evaluation #19 (Signal Coordination). Consider impacts on cross streets, including increased idling.
- AC Transit evaluation of San Pablo Rapid Bus is considering reduced idling as well as increased ridership.

- Concern about alarms going off near refineries. Need to inform residents about procedures they should implement when there are emergencies at refineries.
- TCM 13 (Transit Use Incentives). Raising transit fares reduces ridership.
- Consider looking at the drawbacks of Translink, e.g. loss of free transfers.
- Why are airports not part of the discussion? Pollution from aviation should be targeted.
- Idling at gas stations should be addressed. Idling at Costco in San Leandro should be measured. Concern about numerous pollution sources in San Leandro. Would like to know about health impacts.
- Could simplify formatting of the evaluations. Combine measures needing funding and measuring requiring legislation.
- There will be a group going to Sacramento May 20 to encourage funding for ADA.
- Additional descriptions will be posted to website and discussed at May OWG meeting.

Next Meeting: Thursday, May 20, 2004, 9:00 a.m.